

why say it at all, unless it can be well said? Matthew Arnold little thought the time would ever come when *poets* would pride themselves that what they say is *not* eloquent, *not* well, and *not* true.

When Bret Harte rhymed about Rose, he never told her surname, admitting the

Last name tolerable
Only in prose.

Does "Leered 'neath his eyes' ophthalmic eaves"* sound or feel like poetry? The "new poetry" is full of similar offences—bloody chunks of raw meat served up on the table where we were wont to find the food of the gods! Still more annoying are the pages of "fiddling" details, most of them too petty to be a necessary part of the picture presented. Walking from the street gate to the doorstep becomes a Sabbath-day's journey as it is described by Frost, a well-known representative of the "new poetry."

How does a mere botanist dare to object? They are writing for the people—these are democratic days and not one of them would claim to be only—or solely—"a poet's poet"—or the equivalent in prose. Anyhow, they started it—mixing things up until even hemlock trees must think they really *are* responsible for the death of Socrates, and the lower vegetables—beets and potatoes and "sich"—well, they must be "befuddled quite." If the literary lights don't like our objections, they have two courses open to them: to stop the education of the masses and so eliminate our criticism, or keep out of our garden.

REVIEWS

Forests of Worcester County, Massachusetts†

This seems to be the first of a series of county forest reports made for the Massachusetts State Forester, but like other recent publications emanating from that office, it has no series name or number, so that it must be treated by librarians and

* John Masfield.

† Cook, H. O. The forests of Worcester County. The results of a forest survey of the fifty-nine towns in the county and a study of their lumber industry. 88 pp., 7 unnumbered half-tone plates. Boston, 1917.

bibliographers as an independent book. The localities for the illustrations are not given, and as they are not numbered they are not referred to specifically in the text.

Worcester County is the largest in the state (1,565 square miles), and the field work occupied the author and nine students three summers. Each man took one town at a time and ran parallel lines across it half a mile apart, noting the extent of cleared land and each kind of forest traversed, and putting the results on a field map. The forests are divided into seven types and each of those into four size classes.

Of the total area of the county (which had 256 inhabitants per square mile in 1910) 57 per cent was found to be wooded, 21 per cent tilled, 10 per cent open pasture, 5 per cent brush pasture, and the remainder alder swamps, water, settlements, etc. For each town similar data are given, together with notes on wood-using industries, averaging about a page each. Nearly a third of the forest is a comparatively worthless second growth of gray birch, sugar-maple, swamp maple, and an occasional oak. In the better forests white pine and chestnut seem to be the prevailing trees, the former mostly northward and the latter southward.

If the field workers had classified the standing timber by species, which are pretty sharply defined, instead of by forest types, which often grade imperceptibly into one another, it might have added very little to the cost of the survey, and the results would have been more useful, not only to manufacturers who might desire a particular kind of timber for a special purpose, but also to botanists and other scientists.

ROLAND M. HARPER

Forests of Maryland*

The author, who is the state forester, sums up in this neat quarto volume the results of seven or eight years' work. He had contributed a chapter on forests to the "Plant Life of Maryland," published by the Maryland Weather Service in 1910,†

* Besley, F. W. The forests of Maryland. 152 pp., 17 plates, 23 folded colored maps. Baltimore, "December, 1916." [Published in summer of 1917.] (Previously reviewed by Dr. Fernow in *Journal of Forestry* 16: 113-115. "Jan." [Feb.] 1918.)

† Reviewed in *Torreyia* 11: 36-42. Feb. 1911.